REMARKS

Applicants have thoroughly considered the November 14, 2007 Office action and respectfully request reconsideration of the application as amended. By this Amendment C, claims 1, 18-19, 31, and 47 have been amended to further clarify the invention. Claims 1-47 are presented in the application for further examination. Applicants respectfully request that favorable reconsideration of the application in light of the following remarks and the Examiner is invited and encouraged to telephone the undersigned to discuss making an Examiner's amendment to place the claims in condition for allowance if necessary.

Claim Rejection – 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 18 and 47 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants have respectfully amended the claims 18 and 47 to recite "computer-readable storage media" to clarify the scope of the claims within the patentable subject matter. Hence, the rejection of claims 18 and 47 under 35 U.S.C. §101 should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejection – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-12, 14, 18-28, 31-41, 43 and 47 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 6,694,320 by Ortiz et al in view of US Publication No. 2004/0204946 by Alger et al. Applicants submit that the combined references of Ortiz and Alger fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of the invention.

Amended claim 1 recites, in part, "assigning a namespace to each of the plurality of defined groups, **said assigned namespace identifying one specific brand for each of the plurality of groups, and wherein the plurality of resource files of each of the plurality of groups identify the one specific brand"** and **"selectively** installing the called group of resource files containing the one or more branding resources in the software product in response to the searching **and as a function of the selected namespace**."

In addition to the arguments presented in previous amendments, embodiments of the invention enhance and simplify management of branding of software products by encapsulating branding information into a single branding component having one or more branding resource files as a group. As such, all of the branding resource files need not be installed or applied to a

software product; only the selected branding resources according to the particular group needed for the specified or particular software products are installed. See Application, paragraphs 40, 81 and FIG. 1.

In addition, unlike Ortiz where all branding information is stored in "a single central location" (i.e., cvOEMBrand.DLL) Ortiz, col. 3, lines 24-25, embodiments of the invention assigns **one namespace identifying one group** of resource files. That is, instead of storing all branding data (i.e., one or more brands) in one file, embodiments of the invention disclose that the **assigned namespace is for one specific brand**, and the assigned namespace identifies a plurality of resource files associated with the **one specific** brand. Therefore, Ortiz truly and fundamentally teaches away from aspects of the invention by disclosing specifically **that all branding data is in one file**.

Furthermore, as supported by at least paragraph [0040] of the Application, amended claim 1 also recites, "**selectively** installing the called group of resource files containing the one or more branding resources in the software product in response to the searching **and as a function of the selected namespace**." Applicants respectfully submit that Alger fails to disclose at this feature because Alger merely describes that the installed software "will then locate and use the branding information 204B so that the use of the software 201 evokes an association with the merchant 502B" at paragraph [0041] of Alger. The fact that the software uses the installed branding information with one merchant could not anticipate or could not have rendered the feature "**selectively installing** the called group of resource files containing the one or more branding resources in the software product in response to the searching **and as a function of the selected namespace**" obvious. Moreover, as the Office admits on page 7 of the Office action, Ortiz also fails to disclose or suggest this feature.

Therefore, amended claim 1 is patentable over the cited art. Dependent claims 2-12, 14 and 18 are also patentable for at least the reasons above and for their dependency of claim 1. Hence, the rejection of claims 1-12, 14, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn.

Amended claim 19 recites:

a plurality of resource files, said resource files each containing one or more branding resources and being defined according to form a plurality of groups, said each defined group having a namespace assigned thereto**, said assigned namespace identifying one specific brand for each of the plurality of groups, and wherein the plurality of resource files of each of the plurality of groups identify the one specific brand**; and

a branding engine executed on a computer for calling a particular group of resource files from the plurality of groups as a function of a selected namespace and searching the called group of resource files for one or more of the branding resources to be installed in the software product, said selected namespace corresponding to one or more installed components of the software product, said called group of resource files containing the one or more branding resources being **selectively** installed in the software product in response to the searching **and as a function of the selected namespace**.

For at least the reasons above, Applicants respectfully submit that the combined references of Ortiz and Alger could not disclose or suggest each and every element of the amended claim. Therefore, the rejection of claim 19 and its dependent claims 20-28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn.

Amended claim 31 recites, in part, "assigning a namespace to each of the plurality of defined groups, **said assigned namespace identifying one specific brand for each of the plurality of groups, and wherein the plurality of resource files of each of the plurality of groups identify the one specific brand**...; and **selectively** installing the called group of resource files containing the one or more branding resources in the software product in response to the searching **and as a function of the selected namespace**." For at least the reasons above, Applicants respectfully submit that Ortiz and Alger fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of amended claim 31 and its dependent claims 32-41, 43 and 47. Hence, the rejection of claims 31-41, 43 and 47 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn.

Claims 13, 15, 16, 17, 29-30, 42, 44, 45, and 46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ortiz in view of Alger and further in view of US Publication No. 2003/0195921 by Becker et al. Applicants submit that the combined references fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of the invention. The Becker reference fails to cure the deficiencies of Ortiz and Alger in that Becker's "system and method for configurable software provisioning" fails to disclose or suggest at least "assigning a namespace to each of the plurality of defined groups, **said assigned namespace identifying one specific brand for each of the plurality of groups, and wherein the plurality of resource files of each of the plurality of groups identify the one specific brand**...; and **selectively** installing the called group of resource files containing the one or more branding resources in the software product in response

to the **searching and as a function of the selected namespace**." In fact, even with Becker's disclosures about extensible markup language (XML), componentized software model, and binary files identifying one or more dependencies, the combined references continue to disclose **one file including all branding data,** which teaches away from embodiments of the invention recited in the rejected claims as explained above. Furthermore, contrary to the Office's assertion on pages 19 and 20 of the Office action, Becker fails to discuss or suggest "selected namespace corresponding to a specific brand" and "specifying the selected namespace includes specifying another namespace corresponding to a different specific brand to modify the branding of the software product," respectively. Paragraph 66 of Becker merely discloses how the element "ChangeRegistryKey," "CheckDependency" element, and other elements work. In addition, the namespace needs to be read in the context of "wherein the plurality of resource files of each of the plurality of groups identify the one specific brand." Therefore, Applicants submit that the rejected dependent claims are patentable over the cited art for at least the reasons submitted in support of the independent claims above. Hence, for at least the reasons above, the rejection of claims 13, 15, 16, 17, 29-30, 42, 44, 45, and 46 should be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that independent claims 1, 19, and 31 are allowable over the cited art. The claims depending from these claims are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims from which they depend.

It is felt that a full and complete response has been made to the Office action and, as such, places the application in condition for allowance. Such allowance is hereby respectfully requested. Although the prior art made of record and not relied upon may be considered pertinent to the disclosure, none of these references anticipates or makes obvious the recited invention. The fact that the Applicant may not have specifically traversed any particular assertion by the Office should not be construed as indicating Applicants' agreement therewith.

The Applicant wishes to expedite prosecution of this application. If the Examiner deems the application as amended to not be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited and encouraged to telephone the undersigned to discuss making an Examiner's amendment to place the application in condition for allowance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or overpayment of any required fee during the entire pendency of this application to Deposit Account No. 19-1345.

Respectfully submitted,

/TAN-CHI YUAN/

Tan-Chi Yuan, Limited Recognition, No. L0113
SENNIGER POWERS
One Metropolitan Square, 16th Floor
St. Louis, Missouri 63102
(314) 231-5400

RMB/ATY/caw